



5

Extending Knowledge, Improving Practice and Refining Values: Research Informed by the Concept of Phronesis

Dag-Håkon Eriksen and Marta Strumińska-Kutra

Introduction

In traditional research that aims to explore, describe and explain phenomena, practitioners have limited impact on what is researched and how it is done. They are the end-users of scientific research, responsible for translating knowledge into practice. In this chapter, we focus on a research design that directly involves practitioners in the inquiry process with the goal of advancing both theoretical and practical knowledge. In such a collaborative form of research, practitioners no longer have to ‘wait in a line’ for scientific results to be transformed into applied research and implemented, nor do they have to get research translated into ‘lay language’ (Strumińska-Kutra, 2018). The goal of such pragmatically oriented inquiry is to advance the workability of human praxis; hence, participation, here, is ‘not just a moral value’ but a factor vital to the success of an inquiry (Greenwood, 2007).

D.-H. Eriksen (✉) • M. Strumińska-Kutra
VID Specialized University, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: Dag-Hakon.Eriksen@vid.no; marta.struminska-kutra@vid.no

The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate the potential of collaborative inquiry for research, specifically for exploring and refining organisational values. Designing and conducting this type of research is a form of values work as it enriches the ongoing knowledge and reflection processes that infuse an organisation with values-related actions (Askeland et al., 2020; Espedal, 2019). We argue that this potential can be amplified through an explicit reference to the Aristotelian concept of *phronesis* (practical wisdom), which is understood as knowledge about the right thing to do in particular circumstances (Bachmann et al., 2018).

For some time, *phronesis* has been an important part of action research traditions, since it emphasises the practical, experiential and contextual character of knowledge claims, and additionally, it is inherently action and future oriented (Levin & Greenwood, 2008). The concept has also been used in more traditional, critically oriented research to explore practice-based, contextual knowledge and, therefore, to bridge the theory-practice gap in organisation and management studies (Flyvbjerg, 2001, 2006, 2012). Interestingly, however, the values-based component of *phronesis* has remained a relatively overlooked issue. Attending to the practices through which values are performed can enrich the understanding of how values emerge in organisations: what is seen as valuable, why it is valued and how it is made recognisable (Gehman et al., 2013, p. 86). Values are situated in networks of practice (Gehman et al., 2013, p. 84). In this chapter, we explore this neglected component. Specifically, we focus on the following question: *How can the concept of phronesis facilitate research that is oriented towards expanding knowledge about values, improving practice of values and refining values in organisational settings?* We argue that *phronesis*, when used to inform research design, facilitates a continuous exploration of and reflection over values among research participants. Using such an approach is appropriate when the aim of the research is to create actionable scientific knowledge. This knowledge strives both to advance the causes of the scientific community and to meet the practical demands of individuals like professionals, organisational members and leaders; social settings like organisations and communities; or processes like policy formation, decision-making and planning. We assert that practical demands are not merely demands of effectiveness but also demands for reflection on action and on values, which taken together

improve the quality and workability of practice. We also claim that to realise the aim of knowledge creation, practice improvement and refinement of values, non-academic participants¹ need to be actively included in the inquiry process. The degrees and forms of inclusion may vary, but an inclusive approach is incorporated into the entire research design. When problem formulation, design of research tools, data gathering, analysis and drawing of conclusions are performed collectively, each research project turns into a mutual learning process. To illustrate this, we highlight the use of *reflection* in groups, which can simultaneously serve as a tool for gathering data (like traditional focus group interviews), a tool to validate interpretations from previous research stages (see the chapter on participatory validation) and a tool for facilitating reflection over organisational values and practices. We begin by unpacking *phronesis* as a competence emerging out of a skilful combination of five inter-related elements: contextual knowledge, theoretical knowledge, deliberation, action and ethical reflection (Bachmann et al., 2018; Eikeland, 2006; Kinsella, 2012). By using an example from a participatory action research project in a hospital in Oslo (Aadland & Skjørshammer, 2012), we show how each of these elements can be translated into a specific research design.

Phronesis: Unpacking the Concept

Aristotle described ‘practical wisdom’ (*phronesis*) as a type of knowledge concerned with things that are variable and modifiable. These things are related to human affairs, particular circumstances or concrete occurrences that can be controlled, chosen, initiated, constructed, changed or developed. Practical wisdom deliberates ‘what sorts of things conduce to the good life in general’ both for oneself and for one’s community (Bachmann et al., 2018). *Phronesis* involves deliberation based on values—‘what is good for whom and why’—and is oriented towards action—‘what needs

¹ Although division of labour is blurred in action research (see Eikeland, 2008), we still employ the distinction between academic and non-academic participants assuming that mechanisms of financing participation make a difference.

to be done' (Pitman & Kinsella, 2019, p. 57). Deliberation involves combining different types of knowledge to arrive at a situated, wise judgement about what is the (morally) *right* thing to do in the current circumstances. Translating the concept into research design means constructing an approach to examine what the right thing to do is in the face of the given challenge. This involves deliberating and exploring what the challenge actually is (what is the definition/framing of the problem?); investigating the values underpinning the practice and understanding of organisational processes and deliberating them (how to find out what is at stake?); deliberating possible actions to the challenge (what can be done and how?); acting upon the challenge; and again deliberating and reflecting on the action (was the goal achieved and how could we do better?). This is how the research process becomes at the same time a process of acquisition of theoretical knowledge and learning, improvement in practices and refinement of values. Theoretical knowledge is created by academics involved in the process, while non-academic participants develop practical wisdom about how to arrive at more effective and morally right organisational operations.

In the contemporary management and organisational literature, the most cited applications of phronesis suggest that practitioners and publics can develop practical wisdom by providing context-based knowledge (in contrast to cumulative and predictive theory), knowledge that matters to the researched communities and groups, and knowledge that is effectively and dialogically communicated to non-academic audiences (Flyvbjerg, 2006). These scholars argue that if we provide knowledge that matters—knowledge that focuses on specific values and interests in the context of particular power relations—we may transform research into an activity performed in public for interested publics, 'sometimes to clarify, sometimes to intervene, sometimes to generate new perspectives, and always to serve as eyes and ears in ongoing efforts to understand the present and to deliberate about the future' (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 370; Schram, 2012).

Without questioning the utility of critically oriented research and the importance of discussing research results with affected publics, we argue here that the full potential of phronesis can be unleashed in research practice by involving those affected in the process of action-based inquiry.

The action approach reframes research from a means of collecting accounts of the world (with the research goals to explore, describe and explain) to an opportunity to engage in intersubjective and collective world-making processes that recognise the reflexive capacity of both the researcher and the 'researched' (research goals supplemented with reflect, improve and refine). Research becomes a process of people learning about themselves and their world through reflexive engagement and interaction with one another, which is 'a form of collective self-reflective enquiry' (Kemmis et al., 2014; Langmead & King, 2020).

In what follows, we share an example of how research steps were collaboratively enacted in a project whose goal was explicitly directed at exploration and improvement of values in practice and for practice.² We start with a short description of the project and proceed to unpacking the steps by showing how each of them serves theoretical and practical (including values-based) purposes at the same time. Special attention is given to the stage of data analysis in which the specific nature of collaborative design is most visible. This is the stage where a traditional research method (focus groups) is used in a non-traditional way not only to gather data (what people say during discussions is still documented and treated as data) but also to enhance the analysis process (interpretation and validation of interpretation) and to trigger reflection on the practice and values.

Translating Phronesis into Research Design

Targeting the goals of knowledge creation, practice improvement and refinement of values, research inspired by phronesis is designed to include practitioners and facilitate reflection throughout the process. The degrees and forms of inclusion may vary, but a collaborative approach should affect research design. When the processes of problem formulation, designing of research tools, data gathering, analysis and drawing of conclusions are performed collectively, the research turns into a mutual

²The authors have not used the concept of phronesis themselves but have confirmed the connections over personal communication.

learning process that advances both theoretical and practical knowledge. To achieve this, the researcher needs to navigate between *closeness*, in order to gain access and trust, and *distance* that is needed to stay reflexive and critical of the assumptions both in the domain of practice and in research (Huzzard & Johansson, 2014). By managing this balance, the researcher may achieve the double outcomes of both organisational impact and academic results (Tenkasi & Hay, 2008). But avoiding trade-offs and achieving both societal and academic impact call for careful research design and committed project management (Newig et al., 2019). Building on a model by Aadland (2010), we show how this can be accomplished in practice, and we refer to a project undertaken at a hospital (Aadland & Skjørshammer, 2012) as an example.

Box 5.1 Translating Phronesis into Research Design

In their paper 'From God to Good', Aadland and Skjørshammer (2012) describe a participatory action research project that explored the theoretical and practical tensions involved in sustaining institutional identity in a faith-based hospital within a secular and pluralistic society.

In the context of a Scandinavian welfare state, reason and tolerance have replaced worship and religious commitment as core societal values. The hospital was founded on the diaconal ideals of 'Christian charity in practice' and made every effort to meet its diaconal goals, primarily by ensuring that all professional services were of high quality. Through this project the hospital explored a strategy to entail both a sincere reverence towards the faith-based organisational identity and an openness to new practices to comply with contextual changes. The hospital leadership was quite alert to the need for reflection and reaction to contemporary changes. Their identity was at stake.

The main challenge to the investigation was the collaboration between the researchers and top hospital leadership. The specific project intention was to enhance a participatory process of internal self-reflection on values, practices and changes within the institution. The project was carried out over a period of three years.

Starting with 20 volunteers (hospital workers) conducting 12 different empirical observation studies on values in clinical wards in the pilot phase, the project grew to include all departments of the hospital developing local values projects within all units in phase two. The projects involved 1200 staff members, 120 leaders and users of the hospital. This second stage was inspired by the pilot project and allowed freedom in type, content and methods within independent mini-research projects throughout the hospital.

(continued)

Box 5.1 (continued)

Diverse practices were observed, ranging from internal and informal phenomena—like a lunch break in a department, exchange of experiences between colleagues, staff meetings—to the various interactions between staff and patients, such as receptionists receiving new patients or the use of force in a psychiatric ward. None of the chosen projects specifically focused on a religious perspective. However, the exploration of the diaconal identity of the hospital was, by many participants, perceived as the purpose of the research project, as this was expressed in several comments throughout the sessions. The flow of collective reflection processes on the findings, and the consecutive adjustments and changes of values understandings and practices constituted the results of the project.

Through the project, participants with different perspectives got an opportunity to meet on conceptually 'neutral' grounds to engage in mutual reflections on ideals, values and practices that developed their own competence (i.e. *phronesis*). This helped them navigate the values dilemmas they encountered in a hospital with a faith-based identity situated within a pluralist and secular context. This was confirmed two years later in an external evaluation where the participants of the project affirmed in different ways the usefulness of working with values in the explorative manner of the project. The project enhanced the general ethical sensitivity and the development of awareness of values-in-use throughout leadership and staff.

For the researchers, this project generated rich and complex data on how values are understood, practised and negotiated in the organisation.

The model followed a typical collaborative research structure and included several steps: (1) identifying the area of interest and the objective, (2) data gathering, (3) presenting empirical findings and analysis with subsequent sense-making discussions that finally led to step 4, that is, reflecting on the possible changes in organisational practice and formulating values *for* practice. Although each step serves a different purpose, the involvement of academic and non-academic participants and the deliberative character converts each step into a learning process, where theoretical knowledge is developed and reflection over values and improvement of practice occur.

Identifying the Goal

The research question and objectives are set through collective discussion and decision-making on what area to focus on—preferably areas of practice with a certain significance of meaning to the organisation.

In the example from the hospital, the main emerging challenge was defined in collaboration between the researcher and top hospital leadership. The leadership was quite alert to the need for reflection and reaction to contemporary changes. The specific project intention was to enhance a participatory process of internal self-reflection on values, practices and change within the institution. Realising that the values expressed through behaviour are the ones experienced by patients and their families, the hospital leadership initiated an action research process with a focus on values in-practice: An exploration of how values were conceptualised by hospital staff, how values were related to organisational practices and how this awareness (forwarded by mutual self-reflection) influenced identity formation within the hospital became the areas of interest in the designing of the research project.

This exemplifies that the problem statement requires investigation and that this initial reflection about the focus of the research is an important first step in the collaborative investigation.

Designing Research Tools, Data Sampling and Collecting the Data

To generate the preliminary findings that serve as a starting point for reflection in groups, participants (both academic and non-academic partners, such as members in an organisation or community) together design research tools and the data sampling strategy and collect empirical data on organisational practice. Data gathering can be performed by both the researcher and the non-academic participants through observation, interviews and document analysis, as described elsewhere in this book. The goal is to obtain as specific and concrete descriptions of the practices as possible. One should look for practices where values *in* practice can be observed. The researcher and the participants must allocate time for training adequately in the methods for the data gathering.

In the pilot phase of the research project, 20 staff members voluntarily set out to conduct 12 different empirical observation studies on values in clinical wards. The problem statements were formulated by the participants through group discussions, and each study was carried out in a

ward other than the observer's own. In view of the engagement and promising discussions elicited by the pilot project, the top management decided to involve all departments and staff members of the hospital in developing local values projects within all units. Further, to cover everyone in the hospital, attempts were made to involve users of the services as participants in the project. The participants also received brief training in observation methods.

Analysis

In research informed by phronesis, preliminary findings are presented and discussed to facilitate reflection. The goal of such reflection is to identify tacit knowledge and stimulate the formulation of virtues and vices from the material. In this way, values *in* practice are uncovered and identified. Reflection in groups can be used for both interpreting and validating the preliminary findings³ generated in the second step of research process (Slettebø, 2020). Reflection upon practice helps generate new data *and* triggers learning processes and change.

Collective reflection over practice and values-*in*-practice is central to research informed by phronesis. When reflecting on the preliminary findings of values *for* and *in* practice, practitioners get an opportunity to view their own practice from another perspective, which may facilitate insights and reflection over possible alternative ways of acting. Thus, it enables the development of knowledge, reflection over values and the possible improvement of practice at the same time.

Even from traditional focus groups involving several participants, one may obtain both individual opinions and ideas as well as discussions that yield more nuanced, rich and complex data on values. Researchers also can get access to the interaction between the participants, which enriches the data (Kamerelis & Dimitriadis, 2014, p. 99; Tjora, 2018). In research inspired by phronesis, focus groups engage in *reflection upon practice* as a method to generate, present, interpret and validate data. It is essentially a way to stay close to the people and the organisation in focus (Eikeland,

³ See the chapter by Tone Lindheim on participatory validation in this book.

2008, p. 48; Fook & Gardner, 2007, p. 51). Alvesson and Sköldbberg (2018) define reflexivity as ‘the ambition to carefully and systematically take a critical view of one’s own assumptions, ideas and favoured vocabulary and to consider if alternative ones make sense’.

Collective reflection upon practice in groups can provide access to articulations and expressions of both espoused and implicit values (Fook & Gardner, 2007, p. 24ff and 51; Savaya & Gardner, 2012; Aadland, 2010, p. 160ff). It is a sense-making process, where participants reflect upon values displayed through action (Weick et al., 2005). This calls for a critical-emancipatory perspective on social science leading to new understandings and change, which corresponds with research inspired by phronesis given that, ‘whatever else phronesis might be, we can safely say that it involves reflection’ (Kinsella, 2012, p. 37). A reflective approach is recognised as being helpful for improving practice (Tveit & Raustøl, 2019) as it searches for discrepancies between implicit and explicit assumptions and explores the unarticulated and often tacit nature of values (Savaya & Gardner, 2012).

After the observation of values practices at the hospital (from how the leaders’ values influence the culture of the ward to staff meetings and the atmosphere and aesthetics of the different wards), the findings were discussed by the project group and conveyed to a larger audience of hospital employees and leaders. The project participants demonstrated creativity in selecting the values practices to observe, in interpreting inherent meanings and in choosing different formats of communicating their reflections to the wider audience. Each presentation was followed by a collective reflection on institutional values in-practice, which added to the experienced values of the sub-projects.

Future-Oriented Reflection on Change

Collective reflection in groups with its sense-making, formulating and learning dynamics simultaneously facilitates a conversation on the planning of changes in organisational practice and formulation of values both *in* and *for* practice. Through this process, participants acquire the skills and experience for addressing questions related to values *for* and *in*

practice that assist them in developing the organisational practices and procedures according to their deliberations.

The project at the hospital evolved through three stages over time, with a progressive increase in the number of participants and the number of sub-projects. The flow of reflection processes and the consecutive adjustments and changes in insights and practices constituted the 'results' or the 'findings' of the project. This included, for instance, ensuring that all patients were greeted with respect, positioning the computer screens in the reception such that the receptionists could maintain eye contact with patients while writing down their information, and initiating a 'values-forum' in the psychiatric ward to deliberate on the use of force.

This illustrates how research inspired by phronesis opens possibilities of realising co-development of theoretical knowledge, reflection over values and improvement of practice *at the same time*.

Navigating Challenges

This section addresses some of the challenges associated with participatory approaches.

Resource Intensity (Time, Skills)

Participatory methods for data collection demand time and resources from the participants, which are not always available. Alternatively, the researcher can collect and present preliminary findings to the group as a basis for collective reflection. The researcher can also present the findings in the form of a vignette, which is a short fictional story containing a dilemma or a situation that highlights the values in practice. Serving as elicitation tools (Wilks, 2004, p. 82), vignettes are well suited to facilitating a discussion on difficult and sensitive topics, and they allow dilemmas and fuzziness, which can help in theorising (Wilks, 2004, p. 82ff). The use of short videos illustrating real situations as catalysts for reflection in groups is another option (Kogen, 2019).

Ambiguities Regarding the Nature of Empirical Data

The data emerging from this process may be rich, complex and possibly conflicting, thus serving as ‘a resource for developing theoretical ideas through the active mobilization and problematization of existing frameworks’ (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011). The empirical material can be used to facilitate and encourage critical reflection not only among participants but also among researchers, enhancing the latter’s ability to challenge, rethink and illustrate theory (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011). This leads us to an important question: what constitutes data in this type of research? For the researcher, data may stem from preliminary findings presented as a basis for reflection in the groups, it could refer to the reflections and interactions in the groups, and it could also refer to documenting the common process of planning and conducting the participatory research project (e.g. observation of the overall process or records or minutes of the meetings). In every step of this process, rich data about values in the organisation may be generated, and the researchers will analyse and use all this data to increase their understanding and advance the scientific knowledge on the subject. This should be addressed in the dialogue between the researcher and the participants for ethical reasons. Data in itself cannot always be separated from how it is constructed, and for theoretical reasoning, the construction of the data should also be taken into account (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2011).

Power Asymmetries

The reverse side of empirical inquiry (data gathering and analysing) is a process of learning for both the researcher and the participants. This includes building up of experiences, knowledge and competence—including practical wisdom. Reflection in groups may adequately facilitate the generation of data on the practices, processes and values in organisations. At the same time, the method advances research inspired by *phronesis* by offering a way to be in dialogue with those being studied in the organisation. It is a route to facilitate the development of *their* practical wisdom (*phronesis*), which increases their ability to develop the

organisation further according to their deliberations. As such it is an example of co-production of knowledge and the application of it *simultaneously*.

This process of learning and reflecting requires psychological safety and trust so that participants can share their reflections in a non-threatening environment (Cartel et al., 2018). This was also a concern in the hospital project used as an example in this chapter. Those engaged in the project sought to create a safe communicative space throughout the hospital and safeguard unforced reflections on how values are expressed through established patterns of action, routine practices and hospital procedures. However, it is important to acknowledge the challenges in establishing such a setting in a real politicised organisational life where people are positioned at different social locations. A *third* space for open communication where the people of power and marginalisation meet on neutral ground is needed (Bhabha & Rutherford, 2006; Ikas & Wagner, 2008; Kemmis, 2010). Fook and Gardner (2007) discussed how establishing a trusting climate in the groups necessitates allowing *time* for presentations of the participants and to explain for the implementation of the purpose and various steps of the process. To facilitate a climate for critical reflection, Fook and Askeland (2007) point to the need for emphasising the learning purpose, to clarify the use of self-disclosure and the need to set up an alternative cultural environment. The lack of such spaces for reflection might reduce the impact of the research, as documented by Coleman and Rippin (2000, p. 586). Lee et al. (2020) noted how the establishment of spaces that were separated temporally and symbolically from the ordinary work environment as well as scripts with rules for participant interactions helped establish relational dynamics, characterised by respect, openness and connectedness. They found that the necessary conditions for this were support from the leadership and help from an external facilitator. The improved relational dynamics spilled over from the assigned spaces to everyday interactions.

For research inspired by phronesis, open spaces for critical reflection are paramount, and the researcher must help facilitate this, including room for wonder and sudden discovery. This may require skills of process facilitation as a researcher is not the only person active in the research process. Researchers must also be aware of the possible power dynamics between themselves and the participants.

Division of Labour

Another challenge for both researchers and practitioners in this type of research is that the divisions of labour between the knower (researchers) and the known (the researched) are changed in all the steps of the research process (Strumińska-Kutra, 2016). Participants are expected to be active, learning and reflecting. The researcher is a teacher but also a learner who benefits from the store of experience and judgement of other practitioners. A researcher is a facilitator but also a collaborator who participates in the research process directly and coaches the other practitioners in ways that can facilitate the development of their phronesis.

Achieving Change

Although we argue that research inspired by phronesis may achieve real change in practice, we realise that practice is influenced and constituted by cultural-discursive, material-economic and social-political arrangements (Wilkinson & Kemmis, 2015) and that some of these factors may be of an external and structural character outside of the participants' sphere of control. In the face of such challenges, a possible strategy for achieving change is to publicly communicate the results from the participative research and create public awareness and debate (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Schram, 2012).

Conclusion

Research inspired by phronesis implies a form of collective reflection over values in practice and for practice. It seeks to go beyond exploration, description and explanation towards co-production of knowledge, improvement of practice and refinement of values. This chapter describes a design for collaborative research used to study values in organisations. It is argued for participatory research methods, especially critical reflection in groups. The challenges in establishing open communicative spaces are addressed, and the need for facilitating such spaces and reflection is

underlined. The chapter also sheds light on the role of the researcher and the need for facilitation and project management skills. If successful in realising such a collaborative approach, the researcher may achieve double outcomes of organisational impact and academic results (Tenkasi & Hay, 2008). Research informed by phronesis can enhance the ongoing knowledge and reflection-creating processes that infuse an organisation with values-related actions. Thus, it can be seen as a type of values work (Askeland et al., 2020; Espedal, 2019). The chapter illustrates that research inspired by phronesis has the potential to not only describe but also refine and improve knowledge, practice and reflections upon values in organisations. This renders it a promising way to *simultaneously* study values *and* perform values work in organisations within the pragmatist paradigm.

Acknowledgments The authors will acknowledge valuable comments from Einar Aadland, Olav Eikeland, the editors, and anonymous reviewers on the different versions of this chapter.

References

- Aadland, E. (2010). Values in professional practice: Towards a critical reflective methodology. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(3), 461–472.
- Aadland, E., & Skjørshammer, M. (2012). From god to good? Faith-based institutions in the secular society. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 9(1), 83–101.
- Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2011). *Qualitative research and theory development: Mystery as method*. Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2018). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Askeland, H., Espedal, G., Løvaas, B. J., & Sirris, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Understanding values work: Institutional perspectives in organizations and leadership*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bachmann, C., Habisch, A., & Dierksmeier, C. (2018). Practical wisdom: Management's no longer forgotten virtue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153, 147–165.

- Bhabha, H. K., & Rutherford, J. (2006). Third space [Le tiers-espace]. *Multitudes*, 26(3), 95–107.
- Cartel, M., Boxenbaum, E., & Aggeri, F. (2018). Just for fun! How experimental spaces stimulate innovation in institutionalized fields. *Organization Studies*, 40(1), 65–92.
- Coleman, G., & Rippin, A. (2000). Putting feminist theory to work: Collaboration as a means towards organizational change. *Organization*, 7(4), 573–587.
- Eikeland, O. (2006). Phronêsis, Aristotle, and action research. *International Journal of Action Research*, 2(1), 5.
- Eikeland, O. (2008). *The ways of Aristotle: Aristotelian phronesis, Aristotelian philosophy of dialogue, and action research* (Vol. 5). Peter Lang.
- Espedal, G. (2019). *Being compassionate. Institutionalizing through values work in a faith-based organization*. VID vitenskapelige høyskole-avhandling.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Making organization research matter. In S. R. Clegg (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed., pp. 370–387). Sage Publisher.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2012). *Real social science. Applied phronesis* (B. Flyvbjerg, T. Landman, & S. Schram, Eds.). Cambridge University Press.
- Fook, J., & Askeland, G. A. (2007). Challenges of critical reflection: ‘Nothing ventured, nothing gained’. *Social Work Education*, 26(5), 520–533.
- Fook, J., & Gardner, F. (2007). *Practising critical reflection: A resource handbook*. Open University Press.
- Gehman, J., Trevino, L. K., & Garud, R. (2013). Values work: A process study of the emergence and performance of organizational values practices (report). *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1), 84–112.
- Greenwood, D. J. (2007). Pragmatic action research. *International Journal of Action Research*, 3(1/2), 131.
- Huzzard, T., & Johansson, Y. (2014). Critical action research. In E. Jeanes & T. Huzzard (Eds.), *Critical management research: Reflections from the field* (pp. 81–100). Sage.
- Ikas, K., & Wagner, G. (2008). *Communicating in the third space* (Vol. 18). Routledge.
- Kamerelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2014). Focus group research: Retrospect and prospects. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 315–340). Oxford University Press.

- Kemmis, S. (2010). What is professional practice?: Recognising and respecting diversity in understanding of practice. In C. Kanen (Ed.), *Elaborating professionalism: Studies in practice and theory* (Vol. 5, pp. 139–166). Springer Science+Business Media BV.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Springer.
- Kinsella, E. A. (2012). Practitioner reflection and judgement as phronesis. In A. Pitman & E. A. Kinsella (Eds.), *Phronesis as professional knowledge: Practical wisdom in the professions* (pp. 35–52). Brill Sense.
- Kogen, L. (2019). Small group discussion to promote reflection and social change: A case study of a half the sky intervention in India [article]. *Community Development Journal*, 54(4), 695–712.
- Langmead, K., & King, D. (2020). Realizing the critical performative potential of responsible organizational research through participant action research. In O. Laasch, R. Suddaby, & R. E. Freeman (Eds.), *Research handbook of responsible management* (pp. 700–714). Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Lee, M. Y., Mazmanian, M., & Perlow, L. (2020). Fostering positive relational dynamics: The power of spaces and interaction scripts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 96–123.
- Levin, M., & Greenwood, D. J. (2008). The future of universities: Action research and the transformation of higher education. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 211–226). Sage.
- Newig, J., Jahn, S., Lang, D. J., Kahle, J., & Bergmann, M. (2019). Linking modes of research to their scientific and societal outcomes. Evidence from 81 sustainability-oriented research projects. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 101, 147–155.
- Pitman, A., & Kinsella, E. A. (2019). *A place for Phronesis in professional practice: A reflection of turbulent times*. In *practice wisdom* (pp. 57–68). Brill Sense.
- Savaya, R., & Gardner, F. (2012). Critical reflection to identify gaps between espoused theory and theory-in-use. *Social Work*, 57(2), 145–154.
- Schram, S. (2012). Phronetic social science: An idea whose time has come. In B. Flyvbjerg, T. Landman, & S. Schram (Eds.), *Real social science: Applied phronesis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Slettebø, T. (2020). Participant validation: Exploring a contested tool in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 0(0), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325020968189>

- Strumińska-Kutra, M. (2016). Engaged scholarship: Steering between the risks of paternalism, opportunism, and paralysis. *Organization*, 23(6), 864–883.
- Strumińska-Kutra, M. (2018). *Democratizing public management. Towards practice-based theory*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tenkasi, R. V., & Hay, G. W. (2008). Following the second legacy of Aristotle: The scholar-practitioner as an epistemic technician. In A. B. (Rami) Shani, S. A. Mohrman, W. A. Pasmore, & B. S. N. Adler (Eds.), *Handbook of collaborative management research* (pp. 49–72). SAGE.
- Tjora, A. (2018). *Qualitative research as stepwise-deductive induction*. Routledge.
- Tveit, B., & Raustøl, A. (2019). Lack of compassion or poor discretion? Ways of addressing malpractice. *Nursing Ethics*, 26(2), 471–479.
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421.
- Wilkinson, J., & Kemmis, S. (2015). Practice theory: Viewing leadership as leading. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(4), 342–358.
- Wilks, T. (2004). The use of vignettes in qualitative research into social work values. *Qualitative Social Work: Research and Practice*, 3(1), 78–87.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

